

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 5, 2007. Claims 5-20, 22-34, 112-114 and 129 -137 are presented for examination, of which Claims 5, 22, 112 and 135 are in independent form. Claims 1, 110, 111, 125, 126 and 128 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 5, 18, 22, 32 and 112 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 135-137 have been added to ensure Applicant of a full measure of protection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 18, 19, 32 and 33 were objected to as not further limiting the scope of the claims from which they respectively depend. Claims 18 and 32 have been amended to clarify that they are not meant to contradict their respective base claims. These amendments are believed to eliminate this issue as to all four claims.

Claims 5-17, 20, 22-31, 34, 112-114, and 129-134 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the *Mackinlay* document of record.

Independent Claim 5 now recites, among other notable features:

- (1) A plurality of rings are displayed in a nested form, each representing a predetermined date and having data items along it, with data items along an inner ring being displayed smaller, while data items along an outer ring are displayed larger; and
- (2) When zoom-in operation is instructed, sizes of every ring and of every data item are enlarged, a new ring associated with a new time and data items along the new ring are displayed in a center area of the plurality of rings and an outermost ring and data items along the outermost ring are deleted from a display screen, while when

zoom-out operation is instructed, sizes of every ring and of every data item are reduced, an innermost ring and data items along the most inside ring are deleted from a display screen and a new ring associated with a new time and data items along the new ring are displayed in an area outside of the plurality of rings.

As is correctly noted in the Office Action, *Mackinlay* illustrates a spiral calendar visualizer, in Figure 3, and gives no hint or suggestion of a plurality of rings displayed in a nested form, with a temporal direction or data items displayed along each of the plurality of rings. Other visualization techniques are illustrated, such as a pan/zoom view in Figure 1, what *Mackinlay* calls a calendar room, in Figure 2, and a Tower design, in Figure 4. In the pan/zoom design, several months can be viewed at once, and the user can zoom in for detail, or pan from one month to another. As the article itself recognizes, this approach has the cost that the user loses any global context of the information, which is a relatively serious consideration in view of the highly homogeneous appearance of a calendar. In the calendar room, different surfaces of the “room” are occupied by information covering different amounts of time. The left wall, in the illustrated example, shows an entire month, the whole year is shown on the floor, and details of a particular day appear on the back wall. *Mackinlay* considers that the perspective that provides the room-like appearance itself hampers the effective use of this visualization. The tower visualization shows a year, a month, and the details of a particular day, as does the calendar room, but with the year, the month and the day each in a respective parallel plane. In short, though, nothing in that article provides any suggestion, as far as Applicant can see, of any arrangement having nested rings, as recited in Claim 5.

Also, nothing has been found or pointed out in *Mackinlay* that pertains at all to zooming in or out in such a nest of rings. The pan/zoom design shown in Figure 1 makes use of pan and zoom instructions, but only relates to the use of these instructions to navigate along a planar display, and to zoom as needed to render details legible. There does not appear to be any suggestion in *Mackinlay* that such commands would be useful even with the other visualizations discussed in that article, much less anything that would suggest zooming with nested rings, as in Claim 5.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that Claim 5 is allowable over *Mackinlay*.

Independent Claims 22 and 112 are system and computer memory medium claims corresponding to method Claim 5, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 5. In addition, newly added Claim 135 contains recitations of features that are similar to those discussed above, and is believed also to be allowable over *Mackinlay* for the reasons given with regard to Claim 5.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 627323v1